

## Remarks

### For the Claims:

Applicant submitted claims 1-34. A first Office Action, dated 12 March 2007 rejected claims 8-13, 21-23, and 25-34 and objected to claims 1-7, 14-20, and 24. In an Amendment, dated 15 May 2007, Applicant canceled claims 20-34, amended claims 1, 4, 8, and 14, and retained claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-13, and 15-19 as previously submitted. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remained pending following submission of the 15 May 2007 Amendment. This Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 12-15, and 17-19 and objects to claims 10, 11, and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant cancels claims 1-9, 12-13, and 15-16, amends claims 10, 11, and 14, and retains claims 17-19 as previously submitted. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

This Office Action objected to claims 1, 6, and 9 because of some informalities. This Amendment cancels claims 1 through 9. As such, the objection to claims 1, 6, and 9 is moot.

This Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-5, 8, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Conn, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0004640. In addition, this Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Axelgaard, U.S. Patent No. 6,038,485. Claims 12 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conn. Claims 2-3, 7, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conn in view of Watanabe, U.S. Patent No. 6,248,449. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conn in view of Watanabe and Siuta, U.S. Patent No. 4,540,604. Claims 5 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axelgaard. Claims 2-4, 7, 14, and 19 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axelgaard in view of Watanabe. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axelgaard in view of Watanabe and Siuta. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axelgaard in view of Watanabe and Tapper. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axelgaard in view of Watanabe and Carrier et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,352,315. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axelgaard in view of Watanabe and Carrier, and further in view of Tapper.

Due to the cancellation of claims 1-9, 12-13, and 15, the rejections of those claims in view of various combinations of the prior art are no longer relevant.

This Amendment amends each of objected to claims 10 and 11 to independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claim 9. Accordingly, claims 10 and 11 should be found allowable.

Independent claim 14 is being amended to include the limitations of objected to claim 16 and the intervening claim 15. Accordingly, claim 14 should be found allowable. Claims 17-19 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 14. Thus, claims 17-19 should be found allowable by reason of dependency.

Accordingly, this Amendment cancels claims 1-9, 12-13, and 15-16, and amends claims 10, 11, and 14. Currently amended claims 10, 11, and 14 remain in the application and are believed to be allowable. In addition, claims 17-19 remain in the application as previously submitted and are believed to be allowable.

AMENDMENT  
SERIAL NO. 10/784,088  
Page: 8

Applicant believes that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the rejections and/or objections recited in the 2 October 2007 Office Action and that the present application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lowell W. Gresham", written over a horizontal line.

Lowell W. Gresham  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 31,165

Lowell W. Gresham  
5727 North Seventh Street  
Suite 409  
Phoenix, AZ 85014  
(602) 274-6996